



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,977	10/17/2001	Steve Dispensa	1574	1819
28004	7590	10/25/2005	EXAMINER	
SPRINT 6391 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			NAWAZ, ASAD M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/981,977	DISPENSA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Asad M. Nawaz	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the request for continued examination filed on 8/16/05. Claims 1-60 have been amended. No new claims have been added. Claims 1-60 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-60 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8, 15-18, 21-28, 35-38, 41-48, and 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Giroir et al (US Patent No. 6,829,642) further in view of Vogel et al (USPN 6,807,515).

As to claim 1, Giroir teaches a method of operating a probe device for testing a broadband wireless system, the method comprising: executing the plurality of tests to

measure performance of the broadband wireless communication system based on the instruction;(Abstract; col 6, lines 5-30; col 14, lines 20-25)

determining performance information from the plurality of tests;(col 10, lines 17 - 67)

and storing the performance information in a memory of the probe device.(col 11, lines 15-35 and 39-48)

However, Giroir does not explicitly indicate receiving an instruction into the probe device to execute a plurality of test. Vogel et al teaches a wireless network monitoring system in which an instruction is received into the probe device to execute a plurality of test. (Fig 4, col 2, lines 15-23)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Vogel et al into those of Giroir to allow the monitoring system and method for measuring wireless service availability and performance to discover problems and allow their correction based on a user's command and parameters.

Claims 21 and 41 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 2, Giroir teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the probe device is located in a sector of the broadband wireless system. (Fig 10, col 6, lines 5-30)

Claims 22 and 42 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 3, Giroir teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the probe device is located in a customer area of the broadband wireless system.(col 13, lines 51-55)

Claims 23 and 43 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 4, Giroir teaches the method of claim 1 wherein one of the plurality of tests comprises a web surfing test.(col 10, lines 17-67; col 11, lines 30-35)

Claims 24 and 44 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 5, Giroir teaches the method of claim 4 wherein the web surfing test comprises transferring a request for a web page and receiving the web page. (col 10, lines 17-67; col 11, lines 30-35)

Claims 25 and 45 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 6, Giroir teaches the method of claim 1 wherein one of the plurality of tests comprises a bulk file transfer test. (col 10, lines 17-67; col 11, lines 30-35)

Claims 26 and 46 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 7, Giroir teaches the method of claim 6 wherein the bulk file transfer test comprises generating and transmitting a request to retrieve files from a file server and receiving the files from the server. (col 10, lines 17-67; col 11, lines 30-35)

Claims 27 and 47 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 8, Giroir teaches the method of claim 6 wherein the bulk file transfer test comprises transmitting files to a file server. (col 10, lines 17-67; col 11, lines 30-35)

Claims 28 and 48 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 15, Giroir teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising transmitting the performance information from the probe device.(Abstract; col 6, 5-15)

Claims 35 and 55 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 16, Giroir teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising retrieving the performance information from the memory.(Abstract; col 11, lines15-25 and 39-48)

Claims 36 and 56 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 17, Giroir teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the performance information comprises delay.(col 12, lines 3-10)

Claims 37 and 57 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 18, Giroir teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the performance information comprises download speed.(col 10, lines 55-65)

Claims 38 and 58 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 9-12, 19-20, 29-32, 39-40, 49-52, and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroir et al (US Patent No 6,829642) further in view of Vogel et al (USPN 6,807,515) further in view of Lipa et al (US Patent No 6,061,722).

As to claim 9, Giroir and Vogel et al teach the method of claim 1 but do not explicitly indicate one of the plurality of tests comprising a ping test. Lipa et al, however, teaches the method of claim 1 wherein one of the plurality of tests comprises a ping test to measure delay (col 2, lines 14-18; col 7, lines 10-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lipa into those of Giroir to make the system more efficient. Probe devices that test network resources, functionality, and numerous metrics are known in the art. Using one probe device would eliminate the need for multiple devices, their drivers, and many other components that require system resources.

Claims 29 and 49 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 10, Giroir and Vogel teach the method of claim 1 but do not explicitly indicate one of the plurality of tests comprising a raw channel capacity test. Lipa et al,

however, teaches the method of claim 1 wherein one of the plurality of tests comprises a raw channel capacity test. (col 9, lines 1-60)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lipa into those of Giroir to make the system more efficient. Probe devices that test network resources, functionality, and numerous metrics are known in the art. Using one probe device would eliminate the need for multiple devices, their drivers, and many other components that require system resources.

Claims 30 and 50 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 11, Lipa et al teaches the method of claim 10 wherein the raw channel capacity tests comprises a bit error rate test. (col 9, lines 1-60)

Claims 31 and 51 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 12, Lipa et al teaches the method of claim 1 wherein one of the plurality of tests comprises a forward error correction test. (col 9, lines 1-60)

Claims 32 and 52 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 19, Giroir and Vogel et al teach the method of claim 1 but do not explicitly indicate the performance information comprising a the number of dropped

packets. Lipa et al, however, teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the performance information comprises number of dropped packets.(col 2, lines 14-18)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lipa into those of Giroir to make the system more efficient. Probe devices that test network resources, functionality, and numerous metrics are known in the art. Using one probe device would eliminate the need for multiple devices, their drivers, and many other components that require system resources.

Claims 39 and 59 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 20, Giroir and Vogel et al teach the method of claim 1 but do not explicitly indicate the performance information being the number of acknowledgement packets. Lipa et al, however, teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the performance information comprises number of acknowledgement packets.(Fig 4; col 9, 10-30) It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lipa into those of Giroir to make the system more efficient. Probe devices that test network resources, functionality, and numerous metrics are known in the art. Using one probe device would eliminate the need for multiple devices, their drivers, and many other components that require system resources.

Claims 40 and 60 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claims 13-14, 33-34 and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroir (US Patent 6,829,642) further in view of Vogel et al (USPN 6,807,515), and further in view of Fijolek et al (US Patent No 6,553,568).

As to claim 13, Giroir and Vogel et al teach the method of claim 1 but do not explicitly indicate one of the plurality of tests comprising an out of lock indicator test. wherein one of the plurality of tests comprises an out of lock indicator test. (col 8, lines 10-40)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lipa into those of Giroir to make the system more efficient. Probe devices that test network resources, functionality, and numerous metrics are known in the art. Using one probe device would eliminate the need for multiple devices, their drivers, and many other components that require system resources.

Claims 33 and 53 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

As to claim 14, Fijolek teaches the method of claim 13 wherein the out of lock indicator test comprises determining a presence of a clean Quadrature Amplitude Modulation signal.(col 8, lines 10-40)

Claims 34 and 54 are rejected for essentially being the software product and apparatus of the above claim and thus are rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMN
AMN

Saleh Najjar
SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER